

## REMARKS

This application pertains to a novel method for the continuous production of polymers made of vinyl compounds by bulk or solution polymerization.

Claims 1-3 and 5-27 are pending; claim 4 being cancelled by this amendment. The limitations of claim 4 have been added to claim 1, making claim 1 an independent form of claim 4.

Claim 4 stands objected to for use of the expression "roll" wherein --roller-- would be more consistent with the other claims. This has been corrected in the combination of claims 1 and 4, and the objection should now be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because of the recitation of "the preferred feed pump" in claim 5, and the absence of appropriate antecedent support for the expression "the initiators" in claims 7 and 9.

Claim 5 has now been amended to recite --a-- feed pump, as an original expression, and the amended form of claim 1 provides antecedent support for the recitation of "the initiators" in claims 7 and 9.

The rejection of claims 5, 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should now be withdrawn.

Turning now to the art rejections:

Claims 1, 3, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kaegi et al (US 5,510,073) in view of Billmeyer, Jr. et al (Textbook of Polymer Science, second edition, pg 280-284);

Claims 1, 3, 7, 9, 11-14, 18, 19, 22-26 and 26 (sic) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Leugs (U.S. 6,288,162) in view of Kaegi; and

Claims 1-3, 11-19, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as obvious over Hirsch (U.S. 6,506,447) in combination with Kaegi.

The Examiner has indicated however that claims 4 and 5 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection and that claims 6, 8, 10, 20 and 21 are objected to only as dependant from a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

The limitations of claim 4 have now been incorporated into claim 1, making claim 1 an independent form of claim 4. In addition, the language incorporated into claim 1 from claim 4 has been amended to overcome the objection raised by the Examiner with respect to claim 4.

All of the remaining claims depend from claim 1, and therefore also incorporate the limitations of former claim 4, thereby making them allowable over the art.

Claim 5 has been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection, and the incorporation of claim 4 into claim 1 has provided antecedent support for the limitations in claims 7 and 9 which were responsible for the 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection.

It is therefore believed that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the present amendments and remarks it is believed that claims 1-3 and 5-27 are now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of said claims by the Examiner is respectfully requested and the allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

CONDITIONAL PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME

If any extension of time for this response is required, Appellants request that this be considered a petition therefor. Please charge the required petition fee to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

ADDITIONAL FEE

Please charge any insufficiency of fee or credit any excess to Deposit Account No. 14-1263.

Respectfully submitted,  
NORRIS, McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS

By /William C. Gerstenzang/  
William C. Gerstenzang  
Reg. No. 27,552

WCG/tmo

875 Third Avenue- 18<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
(212) 808-0700